1946

File No. B. Ministers' Salaries/46

Legal Department

B BRANCH

P 22(b)/1946

Subject:— A Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

L.A. Bill No. III of 1946

Bom. Act No. XIII of 1946

File No. B. Ministers' Salaries/46

Gen. 194 e.

472-B

Office of the R.L.A.

The requisite draft Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers Slaaries Act, 1937, is sent herewith.

2. Attention is invited to the proviso to sub-section (3) of section 51 of the Government of India Act, 1935. It does not appear that it comes in the way of raising the salary of the Ministers.

3. P.& S.D. will no doubt attach a suitable Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Bill. It will also obtain the recommendation of the Governor under section 82(3) of the Government of India Act, 1935, and send it to the Honourable the Speaker and the Honourable the President with notice from the Honourable the Prime Minister. The requisite draft Order under section 82(3) is sent herewith.

4. The Bill, being a money Bill, will have to be ~~intended~~ introduced in the Bombay Legislative Assembly. (vide section 82(1)(b)).

5. The Bill does not require any sanction under the Government of India Act, 1935, or affect any special responsibility of the Governor under section 52(1) of the Government of India Act, 1935, or fall under clause (a),(b),(c) or (d) of paragraph XVII of the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor.

P.T.O.

P.N.M.

27/4/46

O.C.

Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

U.R.to P.& S.D., No. 3172 dated 29th April 1946. after H.M.(L) and H.P.M. have seen.

H.M.(L).

H.P.M.

MM

16/7-

ORDER.

Political and Services.

~~Legal~~ Department.
Bombay Castle, 22 May 1946.

Government of India Act, 1935

No. 3844 .- In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by sub-section (3) of section 82 of the Government of India Act, 1935, the Governor of Bombay is pleased to recommend to the Bombay Legislative Council the consideration of Bill No. III of 1946. (A Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.) as passed and transmitted by the Bombay Legislative Assembly.

By order of the Governor of Bombay

O.C.
Sd/-
Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay.

MM

16/7-

No. 4086
Legal Department.
Bombay Castle, 31st May 1946.

From
P.M.Moos, Esquire, Bar-at-Law, I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Government of Bombay.

To
The Secretary to the Governor of Bombay

Subject:- A Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

Sir,

With reference to section 75 of the Government of India Act, 1935, I am directed to forward herewith for the assent of His Excellency the Governor, an authentic copy of a Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937, which was read for the third time and passed at the meetings of the Bombay Legislative Assembly and the Bombay Legislative Council held on the 22nd May 1946 and on the 23rd May, 1946, respectively.

2. None of the provisions of the Bill affects any special responsibility of the Governor under section 52(1) of the Government of India Act, 1935, or falls within the purview of clause (a),(b), (c) or (d) of paragraph XVII of the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor of Bombay.

3. The date on which His Excellency the Governor's assent is given may kindly be

entered in the endorsement.

4. I also forward herewith one copy of each of the papers noted in the margin. The

---

1. Bill as ~~amended~~ introduced in the Bombay Legislative Assembly with the Statement of Objects and Reasons.
2. Bill as read for the third time and passed by the Bombay Legislative Assembly and as introduced in the Bombay legislative Council.
3. Bill as read for the third time and passed by the Bombay Legislative Council.

Bill was not referred to a Select Committee.

5. Extracts from the Proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Assembly and the Bombay Legislative Council will be forwarded in due course.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

P.N.M.
31/5/46
o.c.

Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Legal Department.

Through

Political and Services Department.

MM
16/7-

No. G.S. 1819.

Office of the Governor's Secretary
Government House,

From

G.G.Drewe, Esquire, OBE. ICS,
Secretary to the Governor of Bombay

To

The Secretary to Government,
Legal Department,
Ganeshkhind, 12th June 1946.

Subject: The Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1946.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.4086, dated the 31st May 1946, I am directed to return herewith, with His Excellency the Governor's ~~xxxx~~ assent signified thereon, the copy of the Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1946.

Your obedient servant,

Sd/-

Secretary to the Governor of
Bombay.

MM

16/7-

Bills.

A Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY
Legal Department
Resolution No. 3546
Bombay Castle, 11th May 1946.

Memorandum from the Political and Services Department, No.1795/34-III A dated the 11th May 1946, - - Transferring for necessary action, the papers relating to a Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

RESOLUTION.- The Bill with the Statement of Objects and Reasons should be forwarded to the Manager, Government Central Press, Bombay, for publication in the Bombay Government Gazette, dated the 11th May 1946, as Bill No. V of 1946.

2. The Bill and the statement should be translated into Marathi, Gujarati, Kannada and Hindustani (in Urdu and Devnagari scripts) and the translations should be published in the Bombay Government Gazette, on the 18thhe May 1946.

3. The dates of the various publications should be reported to the Secretary to the Bombay Legislative Assembly.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

M.G.Monani

Assistant Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

Contd.

To

The Manager, Government Central Press, Bombay
(with the Bill and S.O.R. and with a request
that 250 Gazette copies of the Bill and the
statement may be forwarded to the Secretary
to the Bombay Legislative Assembly for distri-
bution to the Members of the Bombay Legislative
Assembly and 25 copies for the use of the Legal
Department),
The Political and Services Department,) with a copy
*The Oriental Translator to Government,)) of the Bill
The Secretary to Bombay Legislative Assembly,) and S.O.R.

*With five extra copies of the Bill.

MM

16/7-

Registered No. B-1

The Bombay Government Gazette

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

SATURDAY, 11TH MAY 1946.

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

PART V

(To be translated into Marathi, Gujarati, Kannada and Hindustani (in Urdu and Devnagari scripts) and the translations to be published in the "Bombay Government Gazette". The dates of publication to be reported.)

The following Bill is published under the proviso to rule 80 of the Bombay Legislative Assembly Rules :—

L. A. BILL No. III OF 1946.

A Bill to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937, for the purposes hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows :—

Bom. IV of 1937.

1. This Act may be called the Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Act, 1946. Short title.

2. In section 2 of the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937, in clause (*a*) for the figures "500" the figures "850" and in clause (*c*) for the figures "150" the figures "200" shall be substituted. Amendment of section 2 of Bom. IV of 1937.

Bom IV of 1937.

3. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to have been made on and to have effect from the 3rd day of April 1946. Retrospective operation of Act.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

In view of the increased cost of living it is considered necessary to raise the salary and motor car allowance of the Ministers from Rs. 500 and Rs. 150 to Rs. 850 and Rs. 200 respectively, per month.

11th May 1946. (Signed) MORARJI DESAI.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

M. G. MONANI,

Bombay, 11th May 1946. Assistant Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

BOMBAY: PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS.

Acts.

Publication of the Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Act, 1946.

GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY.
Legal Department.
Resolution No. 4349

Bombay Castle, 15th June 1946.

Letter to the Secretary to the Governor, No. 4086, dated the 31st May 1946.

Letter from the Secretary to the Governor, No.G.S.1819, dated the 12th June 1946:

"With reference to your letter No.4086, dated the 31st May 1946, I am directed to return herewith, with His Excellency the Governor's assent signified thereon, the copy of the Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1946."

RESOLUTION:- The law should be published as Bombay Act No. XIII of 1946 in the Bombay Government Gazette, dated the 15th June 1946.

2. The Act should be ~~published~~ translated into Marathi, Gujerathi, Kannada and Hindustani (in Urdu and Devnagari scripts) and the tranalations should be published in the Bombay Government Gazette.

3. A copy of the Act should be forwarded to the Political and Services Department with reference to the memorandum from that Department No.1795/34-IIIA, dated the 11th May 1946.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

K.M.Chitnvis,
Assistant Secretary to Government.

P.T.O.

To

The Manager, Government Central Press, Bombay (with a copy of the Act and with a request that 15 Gazette copies of the Act may be forwarded to the Legal Department).

The Political & Services Department,) with a copy
*The Oriental Translation to Government,) of the Act.
The Secretary to the Bombay Legislative Council,)
The Secretary to the Bombay Legislative Assembly,

---

*With five extra copies of the Act.

MI

16/7-

167 41

Registered No. B-1

The Bombay Government Gazette

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

SATURDAY, 15TH JUNE 1946.

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

PART IV

(1) Acts of the Local Legislature of the Bombay Province and (2) Acts of the Indian Legislature assented to by the Governor General.

CONTENTS.

	PAGES
BOMBAY ACT No. XIII OF 1946—An Act to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937	158-159

The following Act of the Bombay Legislature having been assented to by the Governor on the 11th June 1946 is hereby published for general information.

P. N. MOOS,
Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Legal Department.

BOMBAY ACT No. XIII OF 1946.

(First published, after having received the assent of the Governor, in the "Bombay Government Gazette" on the 15th June 1946.)

An Act to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937.

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937, for the purposes hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows :—

Bom. IV of 1937.

1. This Act may be called the Bombay Ministers' Salaries (Amendment) Act, 1946. Short title.

2. In section 2 of the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937, in clause (*a*) for the figures "500" the figures "850", in clause (*b*) for the figures "100" the figures "200" and for the words "with a house" the words Amendment of section 2 of Bom. IV of 1937.

Bom. IV of 1937.

"with a furnished house," and in clause (*c*) for the figures "150" the figures "200" shall be substituted.

Retrospective operation of Act.

3. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to have been made on and to have effect from the 3rd day of April 1946.

BOMBAY: PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS.

L. A. BILL No. III OF 1946 (AN ACT TO AMEND THE BOMBAY MINISTERS' SALARIES ACT, 1937).

Mr. B. G. KHER (Prime Minister) : Sir, I beg to introduce Bill No. III of 1946 (an Act to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937) as read for the third time and passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 22nd May 1946.*

The Honourable the PRESIDENT : The Bill is introduced.

Mr. B. G. KHER : Sir, I beg to move that Bill No. III of 1946 be read a time.

Question proposed.

Dr. G. S. MAHAJANI : Sir, is not the Prime Minister going to make any remarks ?

Mr. B. G. KHER : Sir, this Bill is on the same lines as the Bills for the salaries of the President and the Speaker and the Deputy President and the Deputy Speaker, so that there is really nothing for me to add. The figures in this Bill are exactly the same as the figures of the salaries of the President and the Speaker, so that the same arguments which induced the House to accept the two Bills also hold good in the case of this Bill. I do not wish, therefore, to take any more time of the House.

Sir BEHRAM KARANJIA : Can you not make the salaries free of income tax ?

*Appendix 3.

Mr. B. G. KHER: Sir, I may tell the hon. Member why the figure has been fixed at 850. There is no mystic significance attached to the figure 850, but it was thought that in order to enable the Ministers to live practically the same way as they did within the sum of Rs. 500 in the years 1937, 1938 and 1939, today at least a sum of Rs. 750 or thereabout would be required. Hon. Members must have seen that we have raised the salaries and allowance of Members also. Up to now the salary used to be Rs. 75 and the allowance Rs. 3 per day. Rs. 75 has been raised to Rs. 150 and Rs. 3 to Rs. 8 in one way or the other. Similarly, the Speaker's and the President's salaries have been raised, and it was felt that at least Rs. 750 would be necessary for them. It was then discovered that about Rs. 90 or so would be deducted out of that for income tax. So, that meant that the figure would be reduced to about Rs. 600 or Rs. 650. It was, therefore, thought that, instead of providing a salary and making it free of income tax, it would be better to fix it at Rs. 850 inclusive of income-tax. The intention is that the Ministers should get about Rs. 750, plus of course a furnished house and also a car allowance; and they ought to be able to live as upper middle-class men.

Dr. G. S. MAHAJANI (Poona *cum* Satara): Sir, in 1937, when this question first came up for consideration, I expressed the view that Rs. 1,000 per month was about the fair level to fix the Ministerial salaries, and I also said on that occasion that, if in future the Act was sought to be amended in that direction, I personally would welcome the move. The Prime Minister in his reply on that occasion told the House that "it would not be necessary for the Ministers to come before the House for raising their salaries at all, because, if anything, their ambition would be more to reduce their expenses and to live even within a smaller amount than to come before the House and ask for more." Now, it may be recognised that Rs. 850 today will not go even as far as Rs. 500 went in those days, and therefore the Cabinet or the Ministers have not resiled from the position which they adopted in 1937. Yet, Sir, I shall admit freely that as a solution of the problem in the present circumstances of our country the Bill embodies a very good decision. Have I changed? I have not. I hold the same view as I did in 1937, and yet I say that as an *interim* solution of the problem of fixing the Ministerial salaries, the Bill embodies a commendable principle. I shall briefly make my observations in order to state at the end the considerations on which a final long term settlement, if I may borrow that expression from high level politics, can be arrived at.

In 1937 things were about normal, and quite apart from the fact that prices have gone up, the year 1946 is not the same as 1937. A great war intervened during this period and has just concluded. No one knows the exact level at which things will settle down. We see about us that this uncertainty has produced a race between the prices that are soaring high and increasing wages. We also see that almost every section of the community, every class of Government servants is not, unnaturally, clamouring for higher wages. The need of the hour is for men at the helm of affairs to refuse to take more than the necessary minimum and put a check to this race between the wages and the prices. The real solution to the problem facing us naturally lies in increasing the production of commodities, but what is immediately in our hands and in the hands of the Ministers themselves is to refuse to be stampeded into accepting higher payments and thus set an example to the others.

In deciding the level of the salary of Ministers there are certain considerations which I wish to bring to the notice of this House. There are three categories of

[Dr. G. S. Mahajani]

corporate bodies which serve the society. First of all, we have got what are called the Service Institutions, which work on the principle of self-sacrifice. In this category, I include the missionary bodies, and bodies like the Servants of India Society from which we have got a Member amongst us today. Secondly, we have what are called public utility concerns, such as the Railways and Posts and Telegraphs. These are not run on the principle of self-sacrifice, but at the same time there is no—or rather there should not be any—motive in them to earn large profits. I am not referring to the present Railway administration in this country, but in all democratic countries the principle underlying the working of such concerns is that they must be run neither on the basis of self-sacrifice nor with a motive to earn large profits. Thirdly, we have got bodies like large business firms and corporations whose prime motive force is the earning of large profits and dividends. In fixing the salaries of Ministers, of Judges, or of members of the Public Services Commission, or, to take an instance of a smaller sphere, in fixing the remuneration given to our Examiners, there are two entirely different considerations to guide us, for we cannot depend upon the principle of self-sacrifice for a long-term, permanent arrangement. The first consideration is that we must assure to the managers of the State a reasonable peace of mind and maintain conditions which will conduce to a very high standard of public integrity. The second consideration is, that in our democratic polity, politics must be the concern of all; and we must not make too heavy a demand on the spirit of self-sacrifice of the people, since that is bound to keep away large classes of the society, which contain fairly conscientious, capable, potential administrators, from shouldering the responsibilities of the State.

I feel, thereore, persuaded that in the present abnormal conditions through which we are passing, when we do not know the shape of things to come and when we can not assess the final range of payments in the different grades of services, we can only accept the principle of this Bill as an interim solution. But when things settle down down, I have not the least doubt in my mind that the view which I took in 1937, and which I hold even today, that the salaries of Ministers and of those in that category will have to be fixed at a high level, will be found to be essentially sound. With these observations, I support the provisons embodied in this Bill.

Mr. R. R. BAKHALE: Sir, may I make a few observations with your permission? I deeply sympathise with the remarks that were made by Dr. Mahajani, but it seems to me that it is useless to press the Ministers to increase their salary, because they are so determined on that issue that I am afraid nothing will shake them. The other day, however, I found a ray of hope, and it is this. Since the Congress assumed power in various Provinces, I have been reading the Salaries Bills of the different Provinces, and I was delighted to see that the monotony of uniformity, which was a feature of the Salaries Bills of the Congress-governed Provinces in 1937, had at last been broken. I am sure that what the Congress Governments could not see in 1937, they have seen partially in 1946. What they cannot see today they will, I am certain, see in 1950 or thereabouts, and, therefore, I am extremely delighted to find that the monotony of uniformity, which was such a rigid feature of the Salaries Bills of 1937, has at last been broken. At the same time, it is unfortunate that Bombay should stand at the bottom of the scales. I have read the figures of salaries and allowances of Ministers in several other Congress Provinces, and I find that Bombay, which is supposed to be the richest province, has got the lowest scales, and Bihar, which, only next to Orissa, is supposed to be the poorest, has got the highest scales. I can assure my hon. Friend Dr. Mahajani that proper things will appear on the scene at the proper time, and that too at no distant future.

[Mr. R. R. Bakhale]

I have read the speeches that were made in 1937 on the floor of this House and in the Assembly, and find that the main grounds that were advanced then for fixing the salary at such a low level were (*i*) to put a stop to higher salaries, (*ii*) to fix salary scales in conformity with the general conditions in the country, and (*iii*) to effect retrenchment. I readily grant that the first two objects have been achieved. I am not so sure that the third object has been achieved. In the pre-Reform period of 1936-37, the expenditure on the Executive Council and the Ministers—I am excluding the Personal Assistants and contingent expenditure—was Rs. 2,42,000. In 1937, when the Congress took office, the expenditure was reduced, on the authority of the Prime Minister, by nearly a lakh of rupees. This saving of a lakh of rupees has almost disappeared now, and we are at the 1936-37 level of expenditure of Rs. 2,42,000. This rise over the 1937 figure is due partly to the increase in the salaries and allowances and partly to the increase in the strength of the Ministry. In 1937, there were seven Ministers and six Parliamentary Secretaries. Now we have got ten Ministers and, I think, eight Parliamentary Secretaries. It is likely that the total strength of the Ministry may be increased by one or two in the near future in order to satisfy the communal quota. Therefore, while Government have achieved the object of bringing down the high rates of salaries that were prevalent in the pre-Reform days to reasonable limits, and while the Ministers have fixed their salary in proportion to the general conditions prevailing in the country, I am afraid that they have not been able to effect any retrenchment on account of the reasons I have stated before. So far as the first point is concerned, namely, increase in salaries and allowances, we are glad that Government have sanctioned them—I hope that they will sanction more (*laughter*)—but as regards the second point, I am not so sure of the necessity for such a huge strength of the Ministry, namely, ten Ministers and eight Parliamentary Secretaries. I shall be grateful if the Prime Minister will enlighten this House on this issue. Before 1921, we had only two or three Executive Councillors, who were all European, and latterly, I think, one Indian. During the Montford reforms we had four Executive Councillors and three Ministers. And now we have got ten Ministers and eight Parliamentary Secretaries. Is there really a need for such a large contingent ? If there is, I have nothing to say, and I shall vote for their salary even if it is increased ; but it seems to me that there is no such need.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT : The House meets after six years, and I think that some of the conventions which are there and which I believe to have been circulated are not being observed in practice. I find hon. Members crossing the floor, and going out and entering the House without bowing. I wish to draw attention to this and would state that it would be much better if hon. Members observed all the conventions of the House.

Mr. SHANTILAL H. SHAH : I am sorry, Sir. My lapse was due to inadvertence.

Mr. R. R. BAKHALE : The last point I wish to mention is about the Parliamentary Secretaries. In the three Bills that have been placed before the House on the subject of salaries and allowances, the salary of the Parliamentary Secretaries is not included. Therefore, if, in making a reference to the Parliamentary Secretaries, you, Sir, think that I am not in order, you may kindly pull me up ; but I do feel that when we are considering the salary of the Ministers, we are considering the issue of Government as a whole, and, therefore, I think that I can refer to them. I should like to know what exactly are the functions, duties and responsibilities of the Parliamentary Secretaries ; how they are linked up

[Mr. R. R. Bakhale]

with the Ministers, on the one hand, and the Secretaries to different departments, on the other; and how they are helpful in the general administration of the Province. With these few remarks, I support the first reading of the Bill.

Sir BEHRAM KARANJIA: Sir, I do not understand why the Ministers who have willingly accepted this low salary of Rs. 850 per month should be forced by us to accept more. They know their job well and they have accepted the low figure with the greatest pleasure; but there is one thing which I do not understand and that is the reasons for the disparity in the salaries of Ministers in the various Provinces. I find that the salary of the Ministers in Madras has been fixed at Rs. 1,000 per month. I do not understand why Madras, where the living expenses are comparatively lower, should fix a salary of Rs. 1,000, and Bombay, where the living expenses are very high, should get only Rs. 850.

Mr. B. G. KHER (Prime Minister): Mr. President, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Member from Poona for the very lucid exposition he gave of the justification for fixing the salaries as they have been fixed. He also pointed out that we have not in any manner departed from the principles which we had enunciated in 1937 when these salaries were fixed. Sir, he has urged that this should be considered only an interim solution, and that the long range solution may be different. Now, Sir, the long range solution can only be made when the income of the average man of this country, the standard of living and the difference between the lowest and the highest incomes are better adjusted than they are today. I do not see any prospect of this for years and years to come.

While the salaries of the Ministers of the old regime used to be Rs. 3,000 a month or even more and of the Executive Councillors also much more than the salaries of the Ministers in those days, the principles that actuated us in fixing the salaries of the Ministers at the figures which we have fixed upon were clearly put forward by me when we fixed our salaries in 1937. I remember the hon. Member Dr. Ambedkar, who was in the Opposition, made a vigorous speech and pointed out different considerations so us. Sir, I do not wish to go over the whole ground again; nor do I propose to do so. I only want to tell the hon. Member for Labour that his research into the speeches made at that time, from which he has pointed out the three principles that actuated us in fixing the salaries, remains incomplete. He only seems to have read my speech when I moved the first reading of the Bill. Apparently he did not read my reply to the Honourable Dr. Ambedkar; and even if he did, he does not seem to have realised what was said about the fourth principle. That fourth principle is that of service and self-sacrifice. The first three were given in my first speech, and the last was given so effectively that I believe it convinced the learned Doctor though I am not sure. I asked him what was the remuneration he obtained for serving the Depressed Classes, to whose service he had dedicated his whole life with such fervent zeal, and he had no effective answer to that. And, I told him, Sir, that if he only extended that feeling beyond the limits of the Depressed Classes, to whose service he was devoted, he could very readily understand our feelings. We want to serve the country; we want to serve and suffer for the country, as he wanted to serve and suffer only for the Depressed Classes. That was the difference. When I pointed out to him that in a country like ours, it was not desirable for us to accept his view, but that it was, on the contrary, desirable that we should set a good example to the country of service and self-sacrifice, I believe, even if he did not admit it, it must have convinced him.

[Mr. B. G. Kher]

Now, Sir, I want to tell the hon. Member something about why we have not adopted as a standard the average income of Indians in fixing our salaries. Indeed, Rs. 175 or Rs. 200 a year will not be sufficient for us. We want to increase the average income. We want to see that they get a living wage. What we have done is to see that we get a fairly decent pittance on which we can live without pampering ourselves, that we do not suffer for lack of sufficient means, such as a car and other things, without which we cannot serve our country efficiently, But, beyond that, there is no idea of accumulating wealth, or of living a life of ease and luxury. The Ministers are here to serve, and they must also remember the conditions of the people whom they are supposed to serve. The hon. Member spoke about the Congress Policy and about uniformity of salaries, and I presume he has some knowledge of the principle that the Congress defined at Karachi. We had thought that in a country like India the highest salary, with our present state of incomes, should be about Rs. 500 a month. We have tried to keep before us the same standard. But we did not expect the World War and the cataclysm which have upset the whole mode of living, the currency and the prices. Therefore, even in order to live according to the same standard as we lived in 1937, a rough and ready calculation will show hon. Members that the figures that we have now put before them are necessary. So that, if you are actuated by the same worthy ideal of service and self-sacrifice, as we on this side of the House are, you will not be puzzled. You will not find any difficulty in finding out the principle of the Bill. That, Sir, is my answer to the first point.

Then he raised another point, namely, that our object of retrenchment was not successful because owing to the increase in the number of Ministers and of the Parliamentary Secretaries and of our allowances we will be spending more than we did in 1937-39. Now, Sir, retrenchment is a principle which we always keep before us. But another principle which we must also remember is efficieney. We are here not merely to adorn these Benches, but to carry on the administration of the province efficiently. The work of Government along with the revenue has increased not two-fold, not three-fold, but even more. The hon. Member will remember that our income used to be Rs. 12 crores or so per annum, and that it has now gone up considerably. So also the expenditure. The work that is now required to be done by the present Government is very nearly three times that of the old Government, whose attempts were mainly restricted to the preservation of law and order, or to see that inconvenient people did not agitate too much, or to see that the prisons were kept and run efficiently. But this Government has got a number of constructive, a number of beneficial projects in hand. Due to the war, three new departments have been created during the six years that we were away from office. There is the post-war planning and reconstruction. A number of new problems have arisen, which we had not thought of at that time. It became necessary for this purpose to increase the number of Ministers. It is all due to the hon. Member's lack of experience in forming Ministries that he said what he did. I hope he will some day have what may not be the privilege but the onerous duty of forming the Cabinet, and then he will realise that it is not only the number of Ministers that matters, but that it is both the quality and the quantity of his colleagues that a Prime Minister has to choose that make for efficiency. Take the smaller province of C. P. They have got nine Ministers while we have only ten. Their revenue, I believe is—well, we need not go into these comparisons. There may be more Ministers in one province, and less in others. The question before the House is not how many Ministers we should have. If there was any insinuation that this has been a matter of patronage—that Ministerships and Parliamentary Secretaryships have been given as a matter of patronage for Party purposes—

Mr. R. R. BAKHALE : I deny that, Sir.

Mr. B. G. KHER : I am very glad that there is no insinuation behind the speech of the hon. Member. Then he ought to realise that we have even now not got sufficient Ministers for the work we have in hand. The hon. Member, if he has seen the distribution of our work, will see that, in addition to the Political and Services Department and the general supervision of the whole administration of the province, Prime Minister has had to take up Education. He will see that the Premier and other Ministers are each in charge of two, three and sometimes four important departments, some of which have got an independent Minister in other provinces. In some provinces they have, for instance, a separate Minister for Information. We have no separate Minister for Industry. We have only just enough Ministers, or perhaps even less than enough for doing full justice to all the heavy work of administration that is before us. That, I am sure, will satisfy the hon. Member about the necessity of having ten Members of the Cabinet.

Sir, I do not blame the hon. Member for his ignorance of the institution of Parliamentary Secretaries. I must confess frankly that before I became the Prime Minister I myself was not aware that there was such a thing as a Parliamentary Secretary. When we took up office in 1937, we studied and found that as the Party machine and parliamentary Government are developed, there are a number of matters which arise for administration and which must be looked after, but cannot be looked after, by Ministers. In England, there are not only Parliamentary Secretaries, but there are also Parliamentary Private Secretaries. They are all of them chosen from the ranks of Members who have been elected to the House. Their duties are multifarious. The hon. Member will be interested to know that two of the Governors who came here recently were Parliamentary Secretaries for a fairly long time—nine to ten years—before they came to this country. They said they gained valuable experience during the time, which served them very well in the discharge of their duties. It is the duty of the Parliamentary Secretary to deputise sometimes for the Minister when he cannot look after some work himself because of other engagements. It is his duty also to go and see that the principles of legislation and other matters relating to Government are duly explained to the people, and to deputise for the Minister whenever it is necessary. I might tell the hon. Member, with great respect, that after we took up office in 1937, the Governor of those days, Lord Brabourne, and after him Sir Roger Lumley (now Lord Scarborough) who had considerable experience of parliamentary administration, were of great assistance to us in fixing up the duties and in introducing the system of Parliamentary Secretaries in our province. Many other provinces thereafter sent their own men to find out what was the nature of the duties of this office, and what a Parliamentary Secretary was expected to do. The Governor of those days drew up a very careful and elaborate note as to the duties, the powers and privileges of the Parliamentary Secretaries. I want to tell the hon. Member that, at least, so far as one Parliamentary Secretary was concerned, during the last administration, when I happened to be the Prime Minister, the Parliamentary Secretary for Labour was of invaluable use to me in moulding and shaping our Labour policy and in administering that most important and difficult subject in those critical times. (Hon. Members : *Hear, hear!*) The Parliamentary Secretaryship gives Members the experience which may ultimately enable them to discharge the duties of a Minister also efficiently. The hon. Member will realise that it affords an invaluable training for a Parliamentary Secretary to be working with inside knowledge of the Government machinery and prepare him for shouldering responsibility. It is always the duty and the burden of the Minister

[B. G. Kher]

to take up responsibility for every single act that is done in his own deparmtnet. But his Parliamentary Secretary can assist him in many ways, for instance, by studying subjects and receiving deputations, and relieving the Minister of a number of duties which fall to his share. As I said, I do not blame the hon. Member for not realising the necessity of this office, but I can assure him that in appointing the Parliamentary Secretaries and also the Members of the Cabinet, the greatest care has been taken both as regards the quality and quantity. I am sure this will satisfy the hon. Member, and that now without any grudge he will vote for this Bill wholeheartedly. I hope the hon. Member Mr. Karanjia——

The Honourable the PRESIDENT: The hon. Member is now Sir Behram N. Karanjia.

Mr. B. G. KHER: Sir, I apologise to the hon. Member and beg his pardon; we have not yet passed any resolution for doing away with the use of titles. When we do that, it will be my privilege to refer to him as the hon. Member Mr. Karanjia. But so long as we are using titles, I must correct myself and say, Sir Behram Karanjia.

He said Bombay is the richest Province and there are other Provinces which are poor compared with this Province; but we have put on ourselves an obligation of placing our salaries lower than in other Provinces. Sir Behram Karanjia was born with a silver spoon in his mouth and he cannot understand the pangs of poverty or the conditions of distressed people. If hon. Members think that we have accepted lesser salaries than those in other Province, they ought to be happy instead of being displeased with us. Bombay has the reputation of always setting a good example to other Provinces and if we have done anything in this direction by accepting lower salaries, then I am happy about it and hon. Members will realise that it was a proper thing to do and our example might well have been copied by other Provinces. However, we are not concerned with other Provinces. So far as we are concerned, our anxiety is to do what was fair and proper in the circumstances and the conditions of our Province. Let us not criticise others; let us not unnecessarily and in a boastful spirit praise ourselves. We have done, Sir, what we thought was necessary in the interests of efficient administration and I now hope that this Bill will receive the assent of this House.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is that Bill No. III of 1946 be read a first time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. B. G. KHER: Sir, I move that Bill No. III of 1946 (An Act to amend the Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937) be read a second time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read clause by clause.

Clause 1 (*Short title*) ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2 (*Amendment of section 2 of Bom. IV of 1937*) ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3 (*Retrospective operation of Act*):

The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to have been made on and to have effect from the 3rd day of April 1946.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT: There is an amendment to clause 3 (Retrospective operation of Act) standing in the name of the hon. Member, Mr. Mandlik.

Mr. R. N. MANDLIK: (Kolaba *cum* Ratnagiri): माझी उपसूचना अशी आहे:

In clause 3 delete the words '3rd day of April 1946' and substitute the words '1st day of August 1946'.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT: The amendment is to delete the words "3rd day of April 1946" and substitute the words "1st day of August 1946" in clause 3 of the Bill. I feel that this amendment is on the same principle as his first two amendments. I must point out that under section 51 of the Government of India Act, 1935, it is obligatory that the Ministers' salaries should be fixed, and the Legislature has the duty of fixing these salaries. The question whether they should be paid some time after they have assumed office is irrelevant because the section makes it obligatory on Government to pay the salaries fixed by the House. Therefore, to postpone the date from 3rd day of April 1946 to 1st day of August 1946 is against the spirit of section 51 of the Government of India Act and hence the amendment is *ultra vires*. Has the hon. Member to say anything further in support of his amendment?

Mr. R. N. MANDLIK:

माझा हेतू एवढाच आहे कीं प्राथमिक शिक्षकांना पगारवाढीबाबत जें वचन सरकारकडून दिलें गेलें आहे तें केव्हां पुरें केलें जाणार आहे ह्यासंबंधीं कांहीं तरी निश्चित माहिती मिळावी. प्राथमिक शिक्षकांची स्थिति सध्यां किती हलाखीची झाली आहे त्याबद्दल अधिक माहिती देण्याची जरूरी नाहीं. गेल्या आठवड्यांतच मी एका वर्तमानपत्रांत वाचलें कीं अहमदनगर शहरांत एक शिक्षक व त्याचा मुलगा उपासमारीमुळें मृत्यु पावले. त्या शिक्षकाच्या घरीं खायला नसल्यामुळें व द्रव्याभावीं हवी असलेली वैद्यकीय मदतहि न मिळाल्यामुळें हा प्रसंग त्यांच्यावर ओढवला. प्राथमिक शिक्षकांच्या पगाराचें स्केल वाढवावें, निदान तूर्त त्यांना पगारांत सरसकट १० रुपयांची वाढ व्हावी ही जी त्यांची मागणी आहे ती सरकारनें पुरी करावी एवढीच माझी विनंती आहे.

(*Substance of the above in English.*)

I was expecting to secure some definite information regarding Government's policy regarding primary teachers. In a newspaper of last week I read that one primary teacher and his son died for want of food and medical help. I, therefore, request that Government should grant the primary teachers' request for an increased scale of pay, at least an immediate increase at a flat rate of Rs. 10.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT: Is the hon. Member going back to the same old argument which he advanced in support of his first amendment? If that is so, it is useless and I feel I must rule this amendment also out of order. The first amendment does not prescribe any particular date but merely says: "date from which the primary teachers will be given a new scale of enhanced pay, promised to them by the Prime Minister". Here a particular date is specified, namely, 1st day of August 1946. I wanted to know the reason for this change. I feel the intention is that the hon. Member thinks that by 1st of August the question could be decided.

Mr. R. N. MANDLIK (*Speking in Marathi*) : माझें म्हणणें मी सांगितलें आहे त्यापेक्षां निराळें कांहीं मला सांगावयाचें नाहीं.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT : I hold the amendment out of order.

Clause 3 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

The Preamble ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Mr. B. G. KHER : Sir, I move that Bill No. III of 1946 (An Act to amend Bombay Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937) as read for the third time and passed by the Legislative Assembly be read a third time and passed.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Honourable the PRESIDENT : Bill No. III of 1946 (An Act to amend the Ministers' Salaries Act, 1937) as read for the third time and passed by the Legislative Assembly on 22nd May 1946 is read a third time and passed.

BOMBAY PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS.